

Appl. No. 10/773,971  
Atty. Docket No. 9520  
Reply dated June 28, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated June 7, 2006  
Customer No. 27752

#### REMARKS

The Examiner has required restriction as to Claims 1-11 (Group I) and Claims 12-20 (Group II) because the inventions are distinct. For the purpose of compliance with the election request and to expedite prosecution, Applicants elect, without traverse, Group I, encompassing Claims 1-11.

The Examiner asserts that the inventions are distinct because the inventions of [Group I] and [Group II] are related as process of making and product made. It should be noted that the claims of Group I are drawn to "a kit for providing a web material wound in a roll." The claims of Group II are drawn to a "method of marketing convolutely wound web materials." Thus, Applicants respectfully believe that the instant groupings are not related as process of making and product made, as asserted by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By: 

Peter D. Meyer  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 47,792  
(513) 634-7419

June 28, 2006  
Customer No. 27752